

SN



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,286	12/09/2003	Sung Gi Hwang	K-0590	2595
34610	7590	01/24/2005	<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL</div>	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>3749</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

10/730,286

Applicant(s)

HWANG, SUNG GI

Examiner

Stephen Gravini

Art Unit

3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 is objected to because it recites complimentary, but does not provide a flattering right angle as discussed in the specification. The specification more clearly defines the right angles as complementary. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In that claim, the means plus function recitation as the last feature is considered indefinite under the second paragraph of this statute by invoking 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Shapter (US 2,996,809).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapter in view of Thompson (US 2,679,112). Shapter is considered to clearly anticipate the claimed invention, except for the claimed right angle parallel coupling front support flange. Thompson, another drying apparatus, is considered to disclose a right angle parallel coupling front support flange at column 5 line 70 through column 6 line 6. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Shapter with the right angle parallel coupling front support flange, considered disclosed in Thompson for the purpose of securely fastening the front of a drying apparatus to a cabinet.

Claims 7-8 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapter in view of Smith (US 3,816,942). Shapter is considered to clearly anticipate the claimed invention, except for the claimed bead arranged in rows and four corner flanges supporting positions. Smith, another drying apparatus, is considered to disclose a bead arranged in rows and four corner flanges supporting positions at column 3 lines 40-65 and column 3 line 55 through column 4 line 14, respectively. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Shapter with bead arranged in rows and four corner flanges supporting positions, considered disclosed in Smith for the purpose of securely fastening the front of a drying apparatus to a cabinet.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapter in view of Nikolai (US 3,784,273). Shapter is considered to clearly anticipate the claimed invention, except for the claimed t-shaped protrusions with corresponding hanging holes. Nikolai, another cabinet fixing flange, is considered to disclose a t-shaped protrusions with corresponding hanging holes at column 3 line 64 through column 4 line 17. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Shapter with t-shaped protrusions with corresponding hanging holes, considered disclosed in Nikolai for the purpose of securely fastening the front of a drying apparatus to a cabinet along with a more sturdy support structure.

Claims 11-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapter in view of Toma (US 4,817,298). Shapter is considered to clearly anticipate the claimed invention, except for the claimed fixing member and adjacent

Art Unit: 3749

fixing holes including at least two pins. Toma, another drying apparatus, is considered to disclose a fixing member and adjacent fixing holes including at least two pins at column 4 lines 35-51. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Shapter with the fixing member and adjacent fixing holes including at least two pins, considered disclosed in Toma for the purpose of securely fastening the front of a drying apparatus to a cabinet along with a more sturdy support structure.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapter in view of Robertson et al. (US 6,244,679). Shapter is considered to clearly anticipate the claimed invention, except for the claimed welding protrusions. Robertson, another cabinet apparatus, is considered to disclose welding protrusions at column 3 lines 18-44. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Shapter with the welding protrusions, considered disclosed in Robertson for the purpose of securely fastening the front of a drying apparatus to a cabinet along with a more sturdy support structure.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapter in view of Toma in further view of Robertson et al. Shapter in view of Toma is considered to obviate the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the claimed welding protrusions. Robertson, another cabinet apparatus, is considered to disclose welding protrusions at column 3 lines 18-44. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Shapter in view of Toma with the welding protrusions, considered disclosed in Robertson for the purpose of securely fastening the front of a drying apparatus to a cabinet along with a more sturdy support structure.

Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapter in view of St Louis (US 4,586,269). Shapter is considered to clearly anticipate the claimed invention, except for the claimed plurality of mounting positions symmetrically arranged. St Louis, another drying apparatus, is considered to disclose a plurality of mounting positions symmetrically arranged at column 3 lines 35-58. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Shapter with the plurality of mounting positions symmetrically arranged, considered disclosed in St Louis for the purpose of securely fastening the front of a drying apparatus to a cabinet along with a more sturdy support structure.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References H-J, cited in this action are considered to disclose fixing means for the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira S. Lazarus can be reached on 571 272 4877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3749

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMG
January 14, 2005

Stephen M. Shain